

REMARKS

Claims 18 and 23 have been amended above. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 to 24 are pending in the present application. In view of the submitted amendments and the below remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

The Abstract was objected to for having more than 150 words. Accordingly, the Abstract has been amended above to comply with the 150 word limit. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection has been overcome by the above amendment, and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 18 to 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to a nonpatentable subject matter. Claim 18 has been amended above for clarification. Claim 18 thus provides a computer element defining a structural and functional interrelationship between the computer program and the rest of the computer, as required. See Guidelines MPEP §2106.01. Claims 19-22 depend from claim 18 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been obviated, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 4, 6 to 8, 10 to 17, and 24, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,285,916 to Kadaba et al. ("Kadaba reference").

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1 to 4, 6 to 8, 10 to 17, and 24, because the Kadaba reference does not teach or even suggest every feature of the claims.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for capturing an electronic signature of a user in a java-based environment on a personal digital assistant, requiring capturing an instance of the electronic signature, encoding by a canvas the instance of the electronic signature in a file, and transferring the file by the canvas to an applet. The Kadaba reference does not teach or suggest a method for capturing an electronic signature of a user in a java-based environment in which a file is transferred to an applet, a canvas having encoded the instance of an electronic signature in a file. Instead, the Kadaba reference involves "a recipient of a parcel may use the wand to enter his or her signature into the PDA" and "[t]he signature information is stored in the memory 18," Column 5, lines 44-55. Accordingly, the Kadaba reference does not recite each and every feature of the present invention as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable, and dependent claims

2 to 4, 6 to 8, 10, and 11, which depend from claim 1, are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 12 recites features analogous to those of claim 1, including operating the processing system in a java based environment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 13 to 17 depend from claim 12 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 24 is directed to a network having a mobile device which is adapted to capture a signature, encode the signature and attached the encoded signature to a business object; and a server is adapted to receive the encoded signature and compares the encoded signature to a stored signature file. The Kadaba reference does not teach or even suggest these features. Instead, the Kadaba reference involves querying by name of recipient, date, tracking number or location of the intended recipients. The Kadaba reference is not believed to teach or suggest comparing the encoded signature itself to a stored signature file. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 24 is allowable.

Claims 5, 9, 18 to 22, and 23, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Kadaba reference in view of “Applied Cryptography Second Edition: protocols, algorithms, and source code in C,” by Schneier (“Schneier”), and U.S. Patent No. 6,938,051 to Burger et al. (“Burger”).

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections to claims 5, 9, 18 to 22, and 23, because the cited art fails to teach or suggest all elements of the claims and provides no motivation to combine the referenced teachings.

As discussed above, the Kadaba reference does not teach or suggest a method for capturing an electronic signature of a user in a Java based environment or transferring the file to an applet. The Schneier reference does not cure the deficiency of the Kadaba reference in that the Schneier reference also fails to teach or suggest a Java based environment or transferring the file to an applet.

The Burger reference appears to disclose an electronic Yellow Pages involving a Java applet, but does not teach or suggest a method for capturing an electronic signature of a user in a java-based environment on a personal digital assistant, requiring capturing an instance of the electronic signature, encoding by a canvas the instance of the electronic signature in a file, and transferring the file by the canvas to an applet. Instead, the Burger reference appears to concern printing data into a compact, easily viewable format and teaches using a Java applet in a different way that in the present application. Col. 2, lines 59-61. Moreover,

Applicants respectfully submit that the Kadaba, Schneier, and Burger references are not combinable and no motivation has been demonstrated for such a combination.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Kadaba, Schneier, and Burger references do not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in claims 5, 9, and 18 to 22.

Claim 23 recites features analogous, including a secure signature capturing method performed in a java-based environment for mobile devices, to those recited in claims 5, 9, and 18 to 22, and is therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of all of the above, it is believed that the rejections of claims 1 to 24 have been addressed and obviated. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims 1 to 24 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

If it would further allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: May 16, 2007

By: Jack Chen
Jack Chen (Reg. No. 48,634)

By: Shudy Benet
Reg. No. 47084

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
Tel. (212) 425-7200
Fax (212) 425-5288